



Internal Supervision in Handling Domestic Violence by Police Members: The Role of Investigation Supervisory Officers from the Perspective of Accountability and Conflicts of Interest

Candra Ermala ¹, Harmono ²

¹ Swadaya Gunung Jati University, Cirebon, West Java, Indonesia. Email: malaikat192016@gmail.com

² Swadaya Gunung Jati University, Cirebon, West Java, Indonesia. E-mail: Harmono@ugj.ac.d

Corresponding Author. E-mail: malaikat192016@gmail.com

Abstract

Background. The handling of domestic violence cases involving police members presents complex problems, especially related to independence and accountability in the investigation process. On the one hand, the legal system has provided an adequate normative framework to ensure the professionalism of the authorities and the protection of victims. On the other hand, on-the-ground practice shows a tension between lawsuits and institutional dynamics that affect the effectiveness of internal oversight.

Aims. This study aims to analyze the role of the Investigation Supervisory Officer (Wasidik) in supervising the handling of domestic violence cases by police members, examine the legal basis governing this role, and identify structural and cultural obstacles affecting its implementation.

Methods. This study uses an empirical legal method with a *socio-legal approach*, which views law as a social practice shaped by institutional structures, organizational cultures, and power relations. Data were obtained through interviews with law enforcement officials as well as studies of relevant laws and regulations and scientific literature. The analysis is conducted qualitatively, integrating empirical findings and theoretical frameworks to understand the gap between legal norms and surveillance practices within police institutions.

Result. The results of the study show that normatively internal supervision has been well structured through a formal mechanism, with Wasidik serving as the quality control for the investigation. However, in practice, the effectiveness of supervision is still influenced by structural factors such as a hierarchical bureaucratic system, as well as cultural factors such as corps solidarity and unbalanced power relations. Supervision tends to be oriented towards administrative compliance and institutional risk management, so it does not fully guarantee substantive justice for victims. In addition, transparency limitations affect the public's perception of supervisory independence. The novelty of this research lies in the affirmation that the main problem of internal supervision in domestic violence cases involving police members is not in the weakness of regulations, but in the dominance of organizational culture and the institutional logic that shapes supervision practices.

Conclusion. Therefore, it is necessary to strengthen a supervisory model that is more responsive, transparent, and oriented towards victim protection through increasing the capacity of the apparatus, strengthening supervisory independence, and integrating external accountability mechanisms.

Keywords: internal supervision, Wasidik, domestic violence, police, accountability.



© 2026 The Author(s). This article is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source.

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of domestic violence (KDRT) in Indonesia shows a trend that is not only persistent but also increasingly complex in its character and handling. National data indicate that gender-based violence, particularly in the domestic sphere, is still at an alarming level and tends to increase year by year. This condition confirms that the problem of domestic violence is not just a private problem, but has become a public issue that demands a serious and systemic legal response. Nevertheless, in the midst of a relatively complete legal framework, reality shows a gap between idealized protection norms and law enforcement practices on the ground. From a crime statistics perspective, the high rate of violence is not always directly proportional to the effectiveness of case handling, which indicates a structural problem in the law enforcement system itself (Central Statistics Agency, 2023).

Normatively, the state has built a fairly progressive legal framework through various regulations that affirm the protection of victims of domestic violence and the obligation of law enforcement officials to handle it professionally. The Law on the Elimination of Domestic Violence places victims as subjects who must be comprehensively protected, both from legal, psychological, and social aspects. However, in practice, legal approaches are often still stuck in procedural formalities that are less sensitive to the needs of the victim. Tension between *Das Sollen* (what should be according to law) and *Das Sein* (what happens in practice) becomes increasingly apparent when the law enforcement process does not fully reflect the principle of substantive justice. Within the framework of legal system theory, this condition can be read as a disharmony between the substance of the law and the legal culture that has not fully supported the protection of victims optimally (Friedman, 2011).

This complexity is further strengthened when domestic violence perpetrators come from law enforcement institutions, especially the police. In this situation, the legal relationship is no longer horizontal between the perpetrator and the victim, but is intertwined in a hierarchical and closed power structure. The position of the apparatus as perpetrators presents a potential conflict of interest that affects not only the investigation process but also the independence and objectivity of law enforcement. Dwinanda, Nova, and Afrizal's research shows that in the practice of domestic violence investigation, internal factors such as institutional pressure and organizational culture also influence the use of discretion by investigators (Dwinanda et al., 2025). These findings show that the law does not operate in a vacuum but is influenced by the dynamics of power and social relations within law enforcement institutions themselves.

In this context, the existence of an internal supervision mechanism is crucial for maintaining accountability and integrity in the investigation process. The Investigation Supervisory Officer (Wasidik) plays a strategic role in ensuring that each stage of the investigation is conducted in accordance with the law and professional principles. Conceptually, surveillance serves not only as a tool of administrative control, but also as an instrument to guarantee that power is not abused. Soerjono Soekanto emphasized that the effectiveness of law enforcement is highly determined by the quality of the apparatus and the mechanism of supervision against it (Soekanto, 2014). Thus, the role of the Wasidik cannot be reduced to just a structural complement but rather to a key actor in maintaining the legitimacy of the law.

However, the effectiveness of internal oversight is inseparable from the broader issue of bureaucratic accountability. In practice, internal oversight often faces a dilemma between institutional loyalty and the demands of legal objectivity. Peters argues that accountability in the public bureaucracy is not only hierarchical, but must also reflect moral accountability to society (Peters, 2019). When supervision is more oriented towards institutional stability than towards victim protection, the supervisory function risks being reduced to an administrative formality. This raises fundamental questions about the extent to which internal oversight mechanisms can respond to substantive justice demands in cases involving the apparatus itself.

Furthermore, the responsive legal approach provides a relevant analytical framework for understanding this issue more deeply. Nonet and Selznick position law as an institution that is supposed to be adaptive to social needs and oriented towards substantive justice, rather than simply adherence to formal procedures (Selznick & Nonet, 2003). In domestic violence cases, this approach requires sensitivity to the position of vulnerable victims, as well as the ability of the authorities to avoid institutional bias that can be detrimental to the law enforcement process. Yudistira, in his study, also emphasized that legal innovation in victim protection is important to avoid a rigid legalistic approach that is unresponsive to social realities (Judith, 2019). Thus, internal supervision must move beyond administrative functions to more substantive and humane ones.

On the other hand, various empirical studies show that obstacles in handling domestic violence are not only normative, but also cultural and structural. Research by Siking, Imran, and Achir identified that organizational culture, limited resources, and power relations are factors that affect the effectiveness of victim protection (Siking et al., 2025). These findings are reinforced by international studies showing that police response to domestic violence is

strongly influenced by perceptions, experiences, and internal organizational dynamics (Islam et al., 2024). This suggests that strong regulation does not automatically guarantee fair law enforcement practices if it is not accompanied by changes in the legal culture and oversight system.

Based on this description, it can be seen that the main problem in handling domestic violence involving police members does not lie in the absence of regulations, but in the gap between legal norms and institutional practices influenced by structural and cultural factors. In this context, the role of the Investigation Supervisory Officer (Wasidik) is very strategic to bridge the tension between *das sollen* and *das sein*. This study seeks to critically examine how the role of Wasidik is carried out in practice, what legal basis underlies it, and what obstacles affect the effectiveness of supervision. More than that, this study also aims to formulate a model of strengthening supervision that is not only administratively accountable but also responsive to victim protection and substantive justice demands.

Recent studies on domestic violence law enforcement show that the effectiveness of case handling is not determined only by the availability of legal norms, but also by institutional practice, organizational culture, investigator discretion, and sensitivity toward victims. Previous research has discussed police discretion in domestic violence cases, obstacles in victim protection, gender sensitivity among law enforcement officers, and the gap between legal protection norms and implementation. These studies indicate that domestic violence cases are strongly influenced by structural, cultural, and bureaucratic factors within law enforcement institutions.

However, most prior studies focus on victim protection, investigator discretion, or general police response to domestic violence. Limited attention has been given to the internal supervision mechanism, particularly the role of Investigation Supervisory Officers (Wasidik), when the alleged perpetrator is a police member. Therefore, this paper advances the discussion by placing internal supervision, accountability, and conflict of interest as the central analytical focus in domestic violence cases involving police officers.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Studies on domestic violence (KDRT) in the context of law enforcement show that this problem is not only related to the applicable legal norms, but also to how law enforcement officials respond to and implement these norms in practice. A number of national studies indicate that the handling of domestic violence still faces various obstacles, both structural and

cultural. The study by Dwinanda, Nova, and Afrizal confirms that the exercise of investigators' discretion in domestic violence cases is not solely based on legal norms but is also influenced by institutional pressures and the internal dynamics of police organizations (Dwinanda et al., 2025). These findings show that, in practice, the law enforcement process is not neutral but rather a negotiation between formal rules and institutional interests.

In line with that, the research of Siking, Imran, and Achir revealed that obstacles in the protection of victims of domestic violence do not only come from regulatory limitations, but also from organizational culture and unbalanced power relations between perpetrators and victims (Siking et al., 2025). In this context, law enforcement officials are often in a dilemma between carrying out their professional functions and facing social and institutional pressures. This condition shows that the effectiveness of the law cannot be separated from non-juridical factors that affect how the law is administered. Therefore, it is not enough to study domestic violence solely through a normative approach; it must also consider the broader social and institutional dimensions.

In a more conceptual perspective, the protection of victims of domestic violence requires legal innovations that are able to answer real needs in the field. Yudistira highlighted that legal approaches overly oriented toward formal procedures tend to ignore the substantive justice aspect for victims (Yudistira, 2019). This shows that the existence of the rule of law alone is not enough to ensure effective protection unless it is accompanied by a responsive approach to the victim's social conditions. Thus, law needs to be understood not only as a system of norms but also as an instrument that must adapt to the dynamics of society.

At a broader level, studies of Indonesia's criminal justice system show a gap between the available legal framework and its implementation in practice. Martitah and colleagues' research revealed that the criminal justice system's response to domestic violence is still not optimal, especially in crisis situations, which shows weaknesses in coordination and sensitivity to victims (Martitah et al., 2024). These findings confirm that the legal system is not always able to respond effectively to victims' needs, even though it already has a strong normative basis. Thus, the main problem does not lie in the absence of regulations, but in how these regulations are implemented in practice.

In an international context, Hughes' research shows that police data not only represent criminal facts, but also reflect how institutions perceive and respond to violence in intimate relationships (Hughes, 2025). This shows that the police have a strategic role in shaping the social construction of domestic violence through the investigation practices carried out. In

addition, Islam, Suzuki, and Mazerolle found that police response to domestic violence cases is strongly influenced by risk perceptions, individual experiences, and internal organizational dynamics (Islam et al., 2024). These findings show that law enforcement is not entirely objective, but is influenced by subjective factors inherent in the apparatus itself.

Furthermore, the research of Serrano-Montilla, Lozano, and Padilla underlined that the attitude and perception of the authorities towards victims of violence greatly determine the quality of the response given in the law enforcement process (Montilla et al., 2025). Officials who do not have sensitivity to gender issues tend to result in less than optimal handling of cases and have the potential to strengthen secondary victimization. Meanwhile, Saragi emphasized that although Indonesia already has a fairly comprehensive legal framework in the protection of victims of domestic violence, its implementation still faces various challenges, especially in terms of coordination and effectiveness of law enforcement (Saragi, 2025). These two findings show that the quality of law enforcement is largely determined by human and institutional factors, not solely by the existence of legal norms.

Within the normative framework, the handling of domestic violence and police authority is clearly regulated by various laws and regulations. The Law on the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia provides a legal basis for police officers to carry out law enforcement functions, including the investigation of criminal cases (Regulation of the Chief of the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6 of 2019 concerning Criminal Investigation, 2019). Meanwhile, the Law on the Elimination of Domestic Violence affirms the state's obligation to provide comprehensive protection to victims. At the internal level, the investigation supervision mechanism is regulated through the Police Chief's Regulation on investigation management and the Police Regulation on professional code of ethics, which are normatively designed to ensure the professionalism and accountability of officers in carrying out their duties (Law No. 2 of 2002 concerning the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia, 2002; Law Number 23 of 2004 concerning the Elimination of Domestic Violence, 2004).

However, the existence of these regulations does not necessarily guarantee the effectiveness of supervision in practice. From the perspective of legal system theory, Friedman asserts that the success of the legal system is largely determined by the interaction among legal structure, substance, and culture (Friedman, 2011). In the context of policing, the structure and substance of the law are available through adequate institutions and regulations, but the growing legal culture within the organization often determines how the law is applied. This

view is reinforced by Soekanto, who states that the quality of law enforcement officials is a key factor in determining the effectiveness of law enforcement as a whole (Soekanto, 2014).

Furthermore, from a bureaucratic accountability perspective, Peters emphasized that public officials are accountable not only internally and hierarchically but also to the community (Peters, 2019). In the context of internal police supervision, this is important because supervision oriented solely towards administrative compliance can overlook the dimension of substantive justice. On the other hand, the responsive legal approach put forward by Nonet and Selznick demands that the law be able to respond to social needs more broadly, including in providing protection to vulnerable groups such as victims of domestic violence (Selznick & Nonet, 2003).

Thus, this literature review shows that although there have been many studies that discuss domestic violence and the role of police officers, most of them still focus on the aspect of victim protection or investigator discretion, and have not specifically examined the internal supervision mechanism, especially the role of the Investigation Supervisory Officer in situations of conflict of interest. In addition, the approach used in previous research tends to place the apparatus as law enforcers, rather than as objects of supervision in the context of institutional accountability. Therefore, this study is here to fill this gap by examining more deeply the role of internal supervision in handling domestic violence by police members, by placing the aspects of accountability and conflict of interest as the main focus of the analysis.

As a methodological foundation, the socio-legal approach used in this study holds that law must be understood as a social practice inseparable from the institutional context and power dynamics. Irianto and Shidarta emphasized that legal research is not enough to just about reading norms, but also to reflect on how those norms work in social reality (Irianto & Shidarta, 2018). In this context, internal police supervision is understood not just as a formal mechanism but as a practice influenced by complex structures, organizational cultures, and power relations. Although domestic violence and police accountability have been widely discussed, there remains a research gap in studies that specifically examine the internal supervision of domestic violence cases when the perpetrator is a police member. Previous studies have not sufficiently analyzed how Wasidik functions in situations where institutional loyalty, hierarchical relations, and conflict of interest may affect the objectivity of investigation supervision.

This paper fills that gap by analyzing the role of Wasidik, the legal basis of internal supervision, and the structural and cultural barriers that influence its effectiveness. The study also addresses

the need for a more transparent, responsive, and victim-oriented supervision model supported by external accountability mechanisms.

METHODS

This research uses a type of empirical legal research with a *socio-legal* approach, which treats law not only as a written norm but also as a living social practice, influenced by institutional dynamics and power relations within law enforcement institutions. This approach was chosen because the issue of internal supervision in handling domestic violence cases by police members cannot be understood in its entirety only through normative analysis, but must be seen in the context of practice and institutional reality. Within this framework, law is understood as a phenomenon that operates through the interaction among organizational structures, actors, and cultures, thereby enabling a more comprehensive analysis of the tension between norms and practices. This perspective aligns with the view that legal research must reflect how law operates in social reality, not just at the textual level.

The data sources in this study comprise primary and secondary data that complement each other. Primary data were obtained through semi-structured interviews with key actors directly involved in the investigation and supervision process, such as Investigation Supervisory Officers (Wasidik), investigators from the Women and Children Protection Unit (PPA), and parties involved in internal monitoring mechanisms. The selection of informants is carried out purposively, considering the relevance of their experience and position within the law enforcement structure. Meanwhile, secondary data were obtained from laws and regulations, internal police regulations, and scientific literature relevant to the research theme. Data collection is carried out through document studies and in-depth interviews to dig up information that is not only formal but also reflects empirical practices and experiences in the field.

Data analysis was carried out qualitatively using interpretive techniques that emphasized the meaning of field findings in relation to the theoretical framework used. The analysis process is carried out through the stages of data reduction, categorization of findings, and inductive conclusion-drawing to identify patterns in internal supervision practices. To maintain the validity of the data, this study uses triangulation techniques, both by comparing data sources and by comparing empirical data with the applicable normative framework. With this approach, the analysis focuses not only on procedural suitability but also on how internal

oversight functions in ensuring accountability and substantive justice in the handling of domestic violence cases by police members.

DISCUSSION

Internal Supervision and the Role of Investigation Supervisory Officers in Handling Domestic Violence Cases

Internal supervision in handling domestic violence cases involving police members is basically designed as a mechanism to maintain the integrity and accountability of the investigation process. Within the police institutional structure, the Investigation Supervisory Officer (Wasidik) holds a strategic position to ensure that each stage of the investigation is conducted in accordance with applicable legal provisions. Normatively, this supervision includes an administrative examination, evaluation of the substance of the case, and involvement in the case title forum as a space for collective decision-making. In this framework, supervision functions not only as a control tool but also as an instrument to prevent abuse of authority in the law enforcement process. This perspective is in line with the view that the effectiveness of law enforcement is highly dependent on the quality of the apparatus and the control mechanisms that supervise it (Soekanto, 2014).

However, empirical findings suggest that such surveillance functions do not always work in a fully objective space. In cases involving fellow members of the police force, internal oversight faces complex institutional realities, in which hierarchical relationships and corps solidarity can affect supervisory independence. Interviews with the authorities show a tendency to increase the intensity of supervision in sensitive cases, but at the same time, there is an excessive prudence in decision-making. This condition reflects the tug-of-war between the demands of professionalism and institutional pressures that are not always explicitly visible. The research of Dwinanda, Nova, and Afrizal corroborates these findings by showing that the use of investigators' discretion in domestic violence cases is often influenced by internal organizational factors, including structural pressures and a developing work culture (Dwinanda et al., 2025).

In this context, internal supervision can no longer be understood solely as an administrative mechanism but as a social practice shaped by values, norms, and power relations within the organization. When supervisors and the supervised are in the same organizational structure, potential conflicts of interest are inevitable. This raises critical questions about the extent to which internal oversight can carry out its functions independently. From the

perspective of legal system theory, this condition indicates an imbalance between the structure and culture of the law, where ideally designed norms are not fully internalized in institutional practice (Friedman, 2011). Thus, the effectiveness of supervision is determined not only by the existence of rules, but also by the extent to which professional values are actually implemented by the authorities.

Furthermore, the dynamics of internal supervision tend to focus on institutional risk management rather than substantive victim protection. In practice, supervision is often focused on ensuring the completeness of investigative procedures and administration, while the aspect of justice for victims has not been fully prioritized. This condition indicates that internal oversight still operates within a hierarchical framework of accountability, where it is directed more toward the organization than toward the public or victims. Peters emphasized that effective bureaucratic accountability should not only be oriented towards internal compliance, but also reflect moral responsibility to society (Peters, 2019). In this context, surveillance that fails to reach these dimensions risks losing its social legitimacy.

From the perspective of victims, the lack of transparency in internal oversight mechanisms is also a significant problem. The surveillance process that takes place within police institutions is often not clearly accessible to victims, giving rise to the perception that supervision is not completely independent. This condition strengthens distrust in law enforcement institutions, especially in cases involving the authorities themselves. These findings are in line with research showing that the response of the authorities to domestic violence is greatly influenced by organizational dynamics and internal perceptions, which ultimately affects the quality of handling cases (Islam et al., 2024). Thus, the issue of supervision is not only related to procedures, but also to public perception of institutional integrity.

In a responsive legal framework, this condition indicates that internal supervision has not fully met the need for substantive justice for victims. Effective oversight should not only ensure compliance with procedures, but also ensure that the legal process runs fairly and sensitively to the victim's condition. Nonet and Selznick emphasize that the law must adapt to social needs rather than become stuck in rigid formalities (Selznick & Nonet, 2003). In this context, the role of the Wasidik should not stop at administrative control but should develop into a mechanism capable of bridging institutional interests and real victim protection.

Thus, it can be concluded that internal supervision in handling domestic violence cases by police members is in a space full of tension between norms and practices. Although

structurally and normatively adequate mechanisms are available, their effectiveness is greatly influenced by organizational cultural factors, power relations, and the value orientation underlying supervisory practices. In this situation, the role of the Investigative Supervisory Officer becomes very decisive, not only as a supervisor of procedures but as a key actor in maintaining a balance between institutional accountability and substantive justice.

Legal Basis and Implementation of Supervision: Between Norms and Institutional Practices

The legal framework that governs the supervision of domestic violence investigations by police officers has been developed through a combination of national regulations and internal institutional rules. The Law on the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia legitimizes the authorities' law enforcement functions, including the investigative process, while the Law on the Elimination of Domestic Violence affirms the state's obligation to provide comprehensive protection for victims. At the technical level, internal supervision is strengthened through the Chief of Police Regulation on investigation management and the Police Regulation on professional code of ethics, which are normatively designed to ensure the professionalism and accountability of the apparatus. In this normative framework, the legal system appears to have provided adequate instruments to ensure that every investigative process runs in accordance with the principles of justice and legal certainty (Law No. 2 of 2002; Law No. 23 of 2004).

However, empirical findings show that the existence of comprehensive regulations does not necessarily guarantee effective implementation in the field. In practice, investigation supervision often still operates within a legalistic framework that emphasizes compliance with formal procedures, without being accompanied by sensitivity to the social context of the case, especially in cases of domestic violence. This can be seen in the authorities' tendency to prioritize administrative completeness over the substance of victim protection. Martitah and colleagues' research shows that the criminal justice system in Indonesia still faces limitations in responding to the needs of victims comprehensively, especially in complex and sensitive situations (Martitah et al., 2024). This condition indicates that the law, in practice, is not fully able to bridge normative needs and the social realities faced by victims.

The tension between such norms and practices can be understood through the perspective of legal system theory that emphasizes the importance of a balance between legal structure, substance, and culture. In this context, the legal structure has been established through supervisory institutions and tiered mechanisms, while the legal substance has been

articulated in various laws and regulations. However, in the dimension of legal culture, the implementation of supervision is still influenced by organizational values that tend to emphasize institutional stability and prudence in handling cases involving internal members. Friedman emphasized that the failure of the law often does not lie in the norms, but in the legal culture that does not support the consistent implementation of the norm (Friedman, 2011). Thus, the main problem is not the absence of rules, but how these rules are implemented in the context of organizations with special characteristics.

Furthermore, the practice of internal supervision in domestic violence cases also shows a tendency to use discretion that is not completely free from the influence of institutional factors. In some cases, decision-making in the investigation and oversight process is based not only on legal considerations but also on the implications for the organization's image and stability. This shows that law in practice is often in a compromising position between normative interests and institutional interests. Saragi highlighted that the implementation of legal protection for victims of domestic violence in Indonesia still faces challenges in terms of consistency and effectiveness, especially when dealing with complex institutional dynamics (Saragi, 2025). Thus, the implementation of the law cannot be separated from the context of the power that surrounds it.

On the other hand, an overly procedural approach to supervision can also ignore the dimension of substantive justice that should be the primary goal of law enforcement. When supervision is focused only on compliance with formal rules, the space to consider the victim's condition becomes increasingly limited. Yudistira emphasized that a rigid and legalistic legal approach can hinder victim protection efforts, because the law fails to capture the complexity of the experiences experienced by victims (Judith, 2019). In this context, internal oversight should not only serve as a guardian of the procedure but also as a mechanism that ensures that the legal process runs in a fair and humane manner.

Thus, it can be concluded that there is a real gap between the normative framework of investigative supervision and its implementation in practice. Although regulations have been designed to guarantee accountability and professionalism, the reality on the ground shows that oversight is still influenced by organizational culture factors and institutional interests. The tension between *das sollen* and *das sein* becomes inevitable in this context, thus demanding a more critical and reflective approach in understanding the role of internal supervision. Therefore, strengthening supervision is not enough; it must be achieved through regulatory

improvements and requires a transformation in institutional perspectives and practices so that the law can truly function as an instrument of substantive justice.

Structural and Cultural Barriers and Responsive Supervision Strengthening Models

The implementation of internal supervision in handling domestic violence cases involving police members cannot be separated from various structural and cultural obstacles. Structurally, the hierarchical and tiered character of the police organization creates strong command relationships that, under certain conditions, can limit the independence of supervision. In practice, supervisors and supervised parties are often on the same structural line, making potential conflicts of interest difficult to avoid. This situation means supervision is not entirely free from the influence of subordinate relationships, which can ultimately affect objectivity in the investigation and evaluation process. From the perspective of bureaucratic accountability, this condition shows that accountability still tends to be internal and vertical, not yet fully reaching the broader public dimension (Peters, 2019).

In addition to structural factors, cultural barriers significantly influence the effectiveness of supervision. The strong culture of corps solidarity within police institutions often creates psychological pressure on both investigators and supervisors, especially when cases involve fellow members. In this context, the professionalism of the apparatus is tested by the encouragement to maintain the organization's internal harmony. Research by Siking, Imran, and Achir shows that organizational cultural factors, including patriarchal values and power relations, are one of the main obstacles in handling domestic violence cases (Siking et al., 2025). This condition shows that the law is not only dealing with normative issues but also with social values that are embedded in the law enforcement institution itself.

Another, no less important, obstacle is the limited transparency in internal oversight mechanisms. The internal monitoring process is often not clearly accessible to victims or the public, creating the perception that monitoring is not running independently. This lack of access to information contributes to low trust in law enforcement institutions, especially in cases involving law enforcement. In an international context, Hughes' research shows that how police institutions manage information and case data greatly influences public perceptions of law enforcement integrity (Hughes, 2025). Thus, transparency is an important element in building the legitimacy of internal supervision.

On the other hand, the apparatus's subjectivity is also a challenge in the practice of supervision. Individual perceptions, experiences, and attitudes of the authorities towards

domestic violence cases can affect the way they understand and handle cases. Serrano-Montilla and colleagues' research shows that the sensitivity of the authorities to the issue of violence against women greatly determines the quality of the response given in the law enforcement process (Montilla et al., 2025). If the authorities lack an adequate perspective on victim protection, the supervision carried out may focus solely on administrative aspects, without addressing the substance of justice. This shows that strengthening the apparatus's individual capacity is an integral part of efforts to improve the supervision system.

Given these various obstacles, a model for strengthening supervision is needed that not only focuses on structural aspects but also on cultural transformation and capacity building within the apparatus. One step is to strengthen transparency in the supervision process, for example, by providing victims with more open access to information about the development of the case. This transparency is important to ensure that oversight is not only internal but also socially accountable. In addition, integrating external oversight mechanisms is a relevant strategy for minimizing potential conflicts of interest in internal supervision.

Furthermore, strengthening the apparatus's capacity through a gender-based approach is an urgent need. In this context, the authorities are not only required to understand the legal aspects, but also must have sensitivity to the psychological and social conditions of the victims. This approach is in line with the concept of responsive law, which treats law as an instrument that must be able to substantively respond to society's needs. Nonet and Selznick affirm that responsive law is one that is not trapped in formalities, but is able to adapt to the social realities at face (Selznick & Nonet, 2003). Therefore, internal oversight must be directed to ensure that the law enforcement process not only meets procedural standards but also provides real protection for victims.

Thus, strengthening internal supervision in handling domestic violence cases by police members requires a comprehensive and multidimensional approach. Reform is not enough to be carried out by improving regulations; it must also address aspects of organizational culture, institutional structure, and the individual capacity of the apparatus. In this context, internal oversight must transform from a mere administrative control mechanism to an instrument capable of ensuring accountability, transparency, and substantive justice. Only with a comprehensive approach can surveillance function optimally in bridging the tension between institutional interests and victim protection in the law enforcement system.

The novelty of this paper lies in its argument that the main problem in handling domestic violence cases involving police members is not merely the weakness of legal

regulation, but the dominance of organizational culture, hierarchical bureaucracy, corps solidarity, and institutional logic that shape internal supervision practices. This study specifically highlights the role of Wasidik as a supervisory actor who is expected to ensure accountability, independence, and procedural integrity, while at the same time operating within an institution that may create conflicts of interest.

This paper also contributes a socio-legal perspective by examining internal supervision not only as a formal administrative mechanism, but as a social and institutional practice influenced by power relations, legal culture, and victim-protection demands.

CONCLUSIONS

This study shows that internal supervision in handling domestic violence cases involving police members normatively has a relatively adequate framework through a combination of national regulations and internal institutional mechanisms. Investigation Supervisory Officers (Wasidik) are positioned as key actors in maintaining accountability and integrity in the investigation process through administrative and substantive control mechanisms. However, in practice, such supervision has not been fully able to function independently and optimally. Empirical findings show that oversight remains in tension between legal professionalism and institutional loyalty, ultimately affecting the objectivity and direction of decision-making in the investigative process.

Furthermore, this study confirms a significant gap between *das sollen* and *das sein* in the supervision of domestic violence case investigations. Although regulations have been designed to ensure accountability and protect victims, their implementation remains dominated by procedural approaches focused on administrative compliance and institutional risk management. In this context, internal oversight tends to function as a formal instrument of control that maintains organizational stability, rather than as a substantive mechanism that guarantees justice for victims. This condition is reinforced by structural factors, including a hierarchical bureaucratic system, as well as cultural factors such as corps solidarity and bias in power relations, which indirectly limit the independence of supervision.

Based on these findings, the novelty of this research lies in the affirmation that the main problem of internal supervision in domestic violence cases by police members does not lie in the weakness of regulations, but in the dominance of organizational culture and the institutional logic that shapes the supervision practice itself. This research also reveals that internal supervision has not been fully transformed into a public accountability mechanism but remains

trapped in a hierarchical pattern of internal accountability. Thus, this research makes a conceptual contribution by offering the perspective that the effectiveness of oversight is determined not only by normative design but also by the ability of institutions to manage conflicts of interest and to internalize substantive justice values in practice.

The theoretical implications of this study lie in strengthening the socio-legal approach in understanding law enforcement supervision, especially in the context of the apparatus as a subject as well as an object of supervision. This research expands the understanding that legal system theory and responsive law are inseparable from the analysis of organizational culture and power relations in law enforcement institutions. In this context, internal oversight needs to be understood as a dynamic social practice, not just a static administrative mechanism. This opens up space for the development of a more integrative supervision model between normative, structural, and cultural dimensions.

In practical terms, this study emphasizes the importance of transforming internal supervision towards a more transparent, responsive, and victim-protection-oriented model. Police institutions need to strengthen the independence of supervision by minimizing potential conflicts of interest through more objective and open mechanisms. In addition, increasing the capacity of the authorities from a gender and victim protection perspective is a strategic step to ensure that supervision does not only focus on administrative aspects, but is also able to guarantee substantive justice. Strengthening transparency, including providing victims with access to information, is also an important element in building public trust in the law enforcement process.

In terms of policy, this study recommends integrating external monitoring mechanisms into a more comprehensive monitoring system. The involvement of independent institutions can be an important instrument for reducing institutional bias and strengthening public accountability. Thus, internal oversight no longer stands as a closed mechanism but becomes part of a broader and participatory system of control. In the end, strengthening supervision in handling domestic violence cases is not only aimed at maintaining institutional integrity, but also ensuring that the law is truly present as a tool of protection for victims and a means of realizing substantive justice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Central Statistics Agency. (2023). *Crime Statistics 2023*. Central Statistics Agency. <https://www.bps.go.id>
- Dwinanda, S. F., Nova, E., & Afrizal, R. (2025). Factors Affecting the Implementation of Investigator Discretion in Solving Domestic Violence Cases in the Padang Police Jurisdiction. *Delicti: Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 3(1), 15–27. <https://doi.org/10.25077/delicti.v3.i1.p.15-27.2025>
- Friedman, L. M. (2011). *The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hughes, C. M. L. (2025). Understanding Intimate Partner Violence Through Police Crime Data: Descriptive and Temporal Insights. *Behavioral Sciences*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs16010048>
- Irianto, S. & Shidarta. (2018). *Legal Research Methods: Constellations and Reflections*. Indonesian Torch Foundation.
- Islam, M. J., Suzuki, M., & Mazerolle, P. (2024). Police responses to intimate partner violence incidents involving children: Exploring variations in actions and concerns in an Australian jurisdiction. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 147, 106568. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2023.106568>
- Martitah, M., Sulistianingsih, D., Mohd Yusoff, R., & Ismail, N. (2024). Insufficient criminal justice system response to the severity of domestic violence during the pandemic in Indonesia. *Heliyon*, 10(14), e33719. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e33719>
- Montilla, C. S., Lozano, L. M., & Padilla, J.-L. (2025). *Police Officers' Perspectives when Handling Intimate Partner Violence against Women Cases: A Mixed-Method Approach Using Focus Group and Semantic Network Analysis* | *Journal of Family Violence* | Springer Nature Link. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10896-025-00913-1>
- Regulation of the Chief of the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6 of 2019 concerning Criminal Investigation (2019).
- Peters, B. G. (2019). *Institutional Theory in Political Science: The New Institutionalism*. Edward Elgar.
- Saragi, P. (2025). The Dynamics of Legal Protection Implementation for Domestic Violence Victims in Indonesia: Lessons from International Practices. *Indonesian Journal of Law and Justice*, 3(1), 9–9. <https://doi.org/10.47134/ijlj.v3i1.5012>
- Selznick, P., & Nonet, P. (2003). *The Moral Commonwealth: Social Theory and the Promise of Community*. University of California Press.
- Siking, M., Imran, S., & Achir, N. (2025). Obstacles to the Police in Efforts to Protect Against Domestic Violence. *Al-Zayn: Journal of Social and Legal Sciences*, 3, 1822–1835. <https://doi.org/10.61104/alz.v3i3.1439>
- Soekanto, S. (2014). *Legal Sociology*. Rajawali Press.
- Law No. 2 of 2002 concerning the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia (2002).
- Law Number 23 of 2004 concerning the Elimination of Domestic Violence (2004).
- Yudistira, F. (2019). Legal Innovation for Protection of Victims of Domestic Violence. *Journal of Student Creativity*, 4(2), 189–214. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jcs.v4i2.36079>